

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the interview of April 10, 2007.

Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0170527 to Boehringer et al. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boehringer et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0018637 to Polito et al. Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boehringer et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0162236 to Harris et al. Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boehringer et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0196875 to Blatt et al.

As discussed during the interview, it is believed that the present amendments more clearly define the presently pending claims from the cited art. For example, none of the cited references teach or suggest the amount of the analyte within a test sample being determined from a competitive signal, and at least one of a first detection signal and a second detection signal. As stated in the Interview Summary, Boehringer et al. does not use the signal produced in the barrier zone in order to determine the amount of analyte in the test sample.

It is thus believed that the present application is in complete condition for allowance and favorable action, therefore, is respectfully requested. Examiner DiRamio is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned, however, should any issues remain after consideration of this Amendment.

Appl. No. 10/718,997
Amdt. Dated April 23, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2007

Please charge any additional fees required by this Response to Deposit Account
No. 04-1403.

Respectfully requested,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.



Neil M. Batavia
Registration No. 54,599

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.
P. O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602-1449
Phone: (864) 271-1592
Facsimile: (864) 233-7342

Date: April 23, 2007